Applicant: Bill Shapiro et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-609001 / P562

Serial No.: 10/659,874

Filed: September 9, 2003

Page : 20 of 22

REMARKS

Claims 1-16, 18-43 and 45-54 were pending as of the action mailed on July 13, 2007.

Claims 1, 14, 18, 19, 27, 28, 33, 41, 45, 46 and 54 are being amended.

Claims 9, 20, 36 and 47 are being cancelled and claims 55-78 have been newly added.

No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 14, 27, 28, 41 and 54 may be found within the Applicant's specification at least at page 2, lines 10-12; page 5, lines 23-25; page 6, lines 11-25; and page 7, lines 24-29. Newly added system claims 55-78 correspond to method claims 1-27 and product claims 28-54.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the action are requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The Applicant thanks examiners Joesph Pan and Thanhnga B. Truong for granting an inperson interview on 19 July 2007. The time spent with the Applicant's representatives was greatly appreciated. During the interview, the claims were discussed in light of the prior art. The recommendations made by the examiners were greatly appreciated.

Section 103

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, 19-21, 23-30, 32-36, 38-43, 46-48 and 50-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0237005 ("Bar-Or") in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0117655 ("Someshwar").

Claims 4, 10, 18, 22, 31, 37, 45 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bar-Or in view of Someshwar in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0194485 ("Ram").

Claims 1, 14, 27, 28, 41 and 54

Claims 1, 14, 27, 28, 41 and 54 have been amended to recite limitations not found in the combined teachings of Bar-Or and Someshwar. Specifically, the Applicant has amended claims

Applicant: Bill Shapiro et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-609001 / P562

Serial No.: 10/659,874

Filed: September 9, 2003

Page : 21 of 22

1, 14, 27, 28, 41 and 54 to more clearly define a document management system which maintains a set of access policies for an electronic document having multiple renditions, where the set of access policies apply to the document and the multiple renditions of the document. The claim language, as amended, further recites access policies for a plurality of users, where each user has an identity on the document management system, and where each user is authenticated by the document management system based on the user's identity.

Remaining Claims

The remaining claims depend from or correspond to independent claims 1, 14, 27, 28, 41 and 54, and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

New Claims

Support for the new claims is noted above.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the Applicants do not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicants selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the Applicants decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the Applicants agree with any positions taken by the Examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Bill Shapiro et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-609001 / P562 Serial No. : 10/659,874

Filed: September 9, 2003

Page : 22 of 22

Please apply any charges not otherwise paid or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:_____

Arriènne M. Lezak Reg. No. 51,943

Customer No. 21876 Fish & Richardson P.C. Telephone: (650) 839-5070 Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50428839.doc